

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

10th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. X, No. 7

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

April 15, 1980

Carter Lists Cuts in R&D Spending Plans

The claim from the White House is that research and development got privileged treatment in the election-year budget-cutting derby that preoccupies the capital. But as with most other items in the fiscal chaos that Mr. Carter created when he threw out a three-week old budget and started all over again, it is impossible to obtain a clear picture of what's going on at this moment. And utter skepticism is deserved for any claims about such far-distant periods as the 1981 fiscal year, which begins in the remote haze of next October 1.

For the record, the official figures that have emerged from the marathon cutting sessions of the R&D bureaucracy are as follows:

Overall, the revised budget would reduce R&D spending for the current fiscal year by \$355 million, or approximately 1.1 per cent. For fiscal 1981, the R&D

Frank Press, the White House science adviser, called the Administration's R&D cuts a "pause" or a "holding pattern" that is temporarily required for balancing the entire federal budget.

"It is the Administration's guiding philosophy," according to White House documents released April 2, "that research and development represent an important investment in the Nation's future. Thus, decisions in this portion of the budget reflect the President's continuing commitment to R&D as an important means of achieving long-term economic growth."

Meanwhile, the latest in its series of studies on R&D was released recently by the General Accounting Office and is being used as ammunition against the new budget reductions. The GAO study shows that, if the US is to keep pace with the Soviet Union and other Western European countries, the federal government must substantially increase support for basic science in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

President Carter, however, is going the other way, asking for only \$499 million for basic research at NASA—compared to the \$542 million he requested in January and the \$502 million allocated for the current fiscal year. While few NASA projects would be can-

(Continued on Page 2)

Academy Starts Search For New President—Page 4

budget would be cut by \$1.054 billion, or slightly under 3 per cent.

This "preserves," says an official budget memo, an increase between 1980 and 1981 of nearly \$3.5 billion—over 11 per cent. What's left out, of course, is that 11 per cent is a bit short of the "real" growth that Mr. Carter in January deemed essential for R&D.

For basic research, similar trends are evident. The White House has requested a reduction of \$16 million in obligations for 1980—down 0.3 per cent from the January request. In 1981, the figure would drop by about \$194 million—3.8 per cent below the January estimate.

The White House claims that this still provides for growth. But 8.2 per cent—the 1980-81 increase, in dollars—amounts to shrinkage these days. Overall, the White House would spend over \$4.56 billion on basic research in fiscal 1981—compared to approximately \$4.2 billion in the current fiscal year and \$3.8 billion in fiscal 1979.

While the figures are offered as good news for scientists, it is doubtful that anyone will be especially grateful. Even in January, when the figures were much higher, the projected federal R&D effort was falling behind the rate of inflation, which has now leaped to over 18 per cent. Mr. Carter is now predicting that inflation will drop to 9 per cent in fiscal 1981, but that's widely dismissed as nonsense.

In Brief

IBM Chief Scientist Lewis Branscomb is heading the search for a replacement for NSF Director Richard C. Atkinson, who's going to become Chancellor of the University of California, San Diego (SGR Vol. X, No. 6). Branscomb is taking over soon as chairman of the National Science Board, NSF's top policy body, succeeding Norman Hackerman.

Gilbert S. Omenn, who's been at the White House science office since June 1977 as Associate Director in the life-sciences area, is going to the Office of Management and Budget as Associate for Human Resources, Education, Veterans and Labor Activities—a highly influential job.

Congressional News Notes on Innovation and Productivity, an every-other-month newsletter, is now being issued by the newly formed House of Representatives Task Force on Industrial Innovation. No charge for subs, which can be had by writing to: Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development, 2319 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515.

Ups and Downs in Research and Development

(Obligations, in Millions)

	1979 Actual	1980			1981		
		January Budget	Revised	Change	January Budget	Revised	Change
Defense—Military Functions	12,463	13,781	13,683	-98	16,565	16,343	-222
National Aeronautics & Space							
Admin.	4,411	5,114	5,114	—	5,617	5,398	-219
Energy	4,588	4,919	4,886	-33	5,106	4,990	-116
Health and Human Services	3,485	3,784	3,752	-32	4,011	3,916	-95
(National Institutes of Health)	(2,952)	(3,191)	(3,159)	(-32)	(3,355)	(3,270)	(-85)
National Science Foundation	805	897	897	—	1,056	992	-64
Agriculture	670	743	738	-5	786	778	-8
Environmental Protection							
Agency	410	415	415	—	445	445	—
Interior	405	419	419	—	415	411	-4
Labor	137	279	104	-175	385	104	-281
Transportation	357	353	341	-12	379	366	-13
Commerce	334	371	371	—	379	371	-8
Nuclear Regulatory							
Commission	157	204	204	—	228	228	—
Education	164	146	146	—	156	147	-9
Veterans Administration	130	134	134	—	142	137	-5
All Other	368	397	397	—	465	456	-9
Total, Conduct of R&D	28,883	31,956	31,601	-355	36,136	35,082	-1,054

BUDGET (Continued from Page 1)

celed, many would be slowed down, Press said. For example, approximately \$126 million worth of reductions would occur in space science, space and terrestrial applications, aeronautics and space technology, tracking and data applications programs.

The Department of Defense's new R&D budget, compared to its January allocations, is also scheduled for cuts—approaching \$222 million in fiscal 1981. The majority of the reductions would be directed at strategic and tactical weapons systems, engineering programs, systems studies, analyses, travel, and personnel reductions. But in the present atmosphere of support for boosting the Defense budget, R&D there will actually be going up sharply—from \$13.7 billion to \$16.3 billion.

Medical research and training throughout the government would be reduced a total of about \$400 million under the January requests, according to the budget documents. Budget tables, prepared by Press's office, show that the National Institutes of Health would be affected by only about \$85 million worth of cuts, thus bringing the revised NIH budget to \$3.27 billion in fiscal 1981.

Press insisted at a news briefing a proposed 1-per-cent reduction in basic research for NIH would not jeopardize the Administration's commitment to stabilize the

number of new and competing research grants at about 5000.

If the President's inflation calculations are correct, the R&D budget for the National Science Foundation would actually grow about 2 per cent in the coming fiscal year, though the proposed \$922 million is approximately \$64 million below the January request. Among the adjustments in the Foundation's budget are a phasedown of US-USSR cooperation, a delay in the research-facility upgrading program, reductions in the new initiatives for industrial innovations, reductions in applied research, and some slowdown in the growth of basic research.

Energy research is expected to be largely unaffected by the budget reductions, Press said. Budget documents prepared by the Office of Science and Technology Policy show that obligations for energy R&D would drop by \$116 million, or 2.3 per cent under the President's January requests. Obligations for basic research would fall by \$7 million, or 1.2 per cent. Overall, the basic-research energy budget would jump 12 per cent between fiscal 1980 and 1981.

Even this slight drop, however, will require some adjustments. For example, the Administration would "stretch" the schedule for the ISABELLE high-energy physics project and delay building the Solar Energy Research Institute facility.

(Continued on Page 4)

Some Euphemistic Balm for Covering Budget Cuts

Traces of Orwellian "doublespeak" permeate the explanations that the White House science office presented April 2 for the cuts that have been ordered in spending on research and development.

According to an analysis that the office distributed to the press, "A number of important Administration initiatives in the Fiscal year 1981 budget are *preserved*" (italics supplied).

What becomes clear is that "preserved" is to be understood as meaning reduced but not eliminated.

Thus, in regard to the Administration's highly touted Industrial Innovation Initiatives, the budget analysis merely says that "The expansion of the National Science Foundation's component will be slowed by a \$14 million reduction in obligational authority."

"Slowed"? From what originally intended pace? The analysis, issued by the Office of Science and Technology Policy, fails to illuminate that matter.

An SGR inquiry produced the following: NSF will obligate \$12 million instead of \$20 million for university-industry grants, and \$6 million instead of \$10 million for small business R&D programs.

The Ocean Margin Drilling Program is to be reduced to \$10 million (\$5 million each from government and industry); the plan issued as recently as January called for a \$20-million first-year budget. meanwhile, the *Glomar Explorer*, the big drilling platform that was being eyed for the deep-sea venture, has been put in mothballs, and there's a lot of uncertainty as to whether it's to be refurbished for the project.

And then there's the Cooperative Automotive Research Program, the preservation of which will follow this fiscal course: The federal outlay in 1981, originally set at \$12 million, will be reduced to \$6 million.

And This Is the Plan for Basic Science

(Obligations, in Millions)

	1979 Actual	1980			1981		
		January Budget	Revised	Change	January Budget	Revised	Change
Health and Human Services	1,576	1,728	1,716	-12	1,840	1,804	-36
National Institutes of Health	(1,461)	(1,604)	(1,592)	(-12)	(1,704)	(1,669)	(-35)
National Science Foundation	730	814	814	—	952	903	-49
Energy	464	523	523	—	593	586	-7
National Aeronautics & Space							
Admin.	513	535	535	—	581	520	-61
Defense—Military Functions	362	431	429	-2	523	503	-20
Agriculture	257	289	288	-1	324	321	-3
Interior	77	76	75	-1	78	77	-1
Smithsonian Institution	36	39	39	—	44	44	—
Commerce	25	28	28	—	36	31	-5
Education	20	20	20	—	25	22	-3
Environmental Protection							
Agency	10	14	14	—	19	19	—
All Other	30	32	32	—	58	50	-8
Total	4,101	4,531	4,512	-16	5,074	4,880	-195

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1980

ISSN 0048-9581

Contributing Editor
Anne Roark

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg
Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Susan Burke

European Correspondents

Michael Kenward (London); Francois Segurier (Paris)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except once each in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, \$89.50 (two years, \$168.50); individuals, \$48.50 (two years, \$82.50). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

Science Academy Opens Presidency Search

The ponderous governing apparatus of the National Academy of Sciences has commenced the marathon process of finding a successor for President Philip Handler, who will have reached the allowed maximum of 12 years in the job in June 1981.

Among the NAS elders, the selection of a new president is regarded as very serious business, which accounts for the Governing Council's decision to start the search early and to entrust the chairmanship of the nomination committee to one of the stalwart figures of the scientific community: Kenneth Pitzer, Professor of chemistry at UC Berkeley. Pitzer, who's been a member of the Academy since 1949, served on the General Advisory Committee (GAC) of the old Atomic Energy Commission from 1958-65, a period in which the committee was a main power center in science and government relations; he chaired the GAC from 1960-62, and was President of Rice University from 1961-68.

An NAS spokesperson wouldn't even acknowledge to SGR that Pitzer has been selected for the job; as for Pitzer, he responded to a telephone inquiry by saying that, yes, he was the chairman, but that additional information would have to come from the Academy.

The Academy's sensitivity to inquiries about its election process may stem from the fact that the succession

system there bears some considerable resemblance to a Soviet election. The bylaws specify that the nominating committee "shall present one or more nominees" to the Council—which is to be done in October. Additional nominations may be made by petition of at least 50 members. Ballots will be mailed in December, and the new President will have been selected in time for the annual spring meeting—though he won't take office until July 1, 1981. ("He" is used advisedly, since women scarcely figure at all in the NAS.) The long tradition at the Academy, however, is to have only one candidate emerge from this process. There was an exception in 1950 when Harvard's James Conant, considered a sure shot for the NAS presidency, was beaten by Detlev Bronk, President of Johns Hopkins University, in a rump rebellion. The NAS hushed it up—and it wasn't until nearly 20 years later that the incident received public notice.

Though the Academy presidency routinely attracts notice because of the institution's dual role as both the honorary apex of science and adviser to the federal government, there's a feeling in science-policy circles that some serious erosion of prestige afflicts the NAS.

Handler's presidency has been marked by massive

(Continued on Page 5)

BUDGET *(Continued from Page 2)*

Energy programs funded from the newly passed windfall-profits tax would also be affected by the budget revisions, the White House indicated. Under the original budget, Carter had asked that about \$3.6 billion be set aside for energy development. It's now proposed to trim \$110.5 million from that windfall sum. Although the program is focused on energy development, a number of related research programs would be affected. For example, a \$50-million coal R&D program would be cut almost in half, and funds would also be reduced for basic automotive research.

Press insists that the cuts have been distributed in a "fair and equitable" way, so that every agency has been touched—but only slightly. One example of that distribution can be seen in the White House plans for the Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation. As one of the Carter Administration's pet projects, the institute was to coordinate scientific and technological development efforts overseas.

Although it met strong opposition in Congress and money for this year was eventually held up in a House-Senate conference, the new agency would receive \$30 million in 1981, under the new Carter plan. That figure was \$10 million less than the President's original budget but \$5 million above the figure he requested last year.

The budget in this case may be more in the realm of make believe than reality, given the fact that Congress has bludgeoned the ISTC beyond recognition, and it's not clear at this point whether the agency really exists. But the Administration's treatment of the item is revealing—for it shows that even crippled agencies must tithe to budget cutting.

The appropriations committees, which have said they will give serious consideration to the President's revised plan, are sitting quietly by, while Congress works out the final spending targets for the current fiscal year and the initial spending ceilings for fiscal 1981. So far the House Budget Committee has recommended a \$200-million cut in President Carter's request of \$10.2 billion for health programs. Although the House has not said where those cuts should come, the Senate budget committee has recommended spending only \$9.5 billion, which aides said could hold spending for NIH at the current \$3.6-billion level.

The Senate panel has also recommended holding NSF at its current \$990-million level.

A no-nonsense, budget-cutting mood has evidently spread through Congress in recent weeks. A sign hanging in the conference room of the House Budget Committee earlier this spring seemed to bear witness to that fact. The sign's message was clear: "Abandon hope, All Ye that Enter Here."

Study Says British State Firms Hog R&D

London. In a rare turnabout from the usual litany of industry not doing enough research, an influential advisory group here is contending that Britain's big state-owned corporations perform too much R&D, and ought to spread it around to strengthen the country's technical base.

This is the key conclusion of a new report, "R&D for Public Purchasing," from the Advisory Council for Applied Research and Development (ACARD). An ACARD working group, chaired by D. Downs, Chairman and Managing Director of Ricardo Consulting Engineers Ltd., studied R&D relationships between purchasers and suppliers in five industries: mining machinery, rail transport, road construction, water supply and treatment, and gas supply and distribution.

The working group concluded that the public sector carries out too much R&D in support of its purchasing decisions. "The technical competitiveness of United Kingdom industry in export markets would be enhanced if public sector purchasing organizations—which account for about half of the applied R&D carried out in the United Kingdom—relied more on their suppliers' own R&D or contracted out more of their R&D to the private sector."

The figures on Britain's R&D speak for themselves. In 1975, the last year for which detailed statistics are available, the public sector carried out about \$1 billion worth of applied R&D, out of a national total of some \$3.3 billion. The public corporations, which have grown since 1975, accounted for around \$215 million. ACARD concludes from this that "at least 40 per cent and

New UK Science-Policy Center

London. An independent Centre for the Analysis of Technical Change, designed to study policy issues related to science and technology, is being established here with funds from two government agencies and a private foundation.

Bearing the acronym CATCH, the new organization will receive about \$1.2 million over the next five years from the Science Research Council (similar to the US National Science Foundation) and the Social Science Research Council. In addition, the Leverhulme Trust will contribute about \$3.2 million. The two councils have agreed to raise their funding to over \$500,000 a year if they're satisfied with the first five years of operations.

The councils' interest in the new center traces back to conflicts and tensions over research priorities in a period of big ambitions and limited resources.

possibly 50 per cent of the applied R&D carried out in the United Kingdom is related in some sense to public purchasing decisions."

The net result of this, the report states, is that the public-sector organizations carry out R&D to meet their own needs rather than those of the country's economy. This R&D dominance puts the public sector in a good position when it orders equipment, but because the suppliers are themselves weak on the R&D side, they are not

(Continued on Page 6)

ACADEMY *(Continued from Page 4)*

growth of the Academy bureaucracy, to the point where it's now a \$100-million-a-year organization. The troubled relationship that he inherited with the fledgling and subsidiary National Academy of Engineering has settled down into a kind of live-and-let live situation. But with NAE President Courtland Perkins due to retire from office just one year after Handler does, the incoming President of the National Academy of Sciences is going to face the question of what next in the relationship.

Though NAS is the holder of the Congressional charter under which NAE functions, Perkins has been building up a reserve cash fund for the engineers. He says that the two academies get on well at present, but he doesn't want to leave his successor without options if things go sour under a new NAS president.

Handler is credited with expanding the Academy, rationalizing its internal workings, and taking a leadership role in behalf of abused Soviet dissident scientists as well as scientist victims of oppression in other nations.

But what's evident in Washington—both in and out of science-policy circles—is that the Academy now wields relatively little influence in the capital. Its performance on the long-lingering study known as CONAES (for Committee on Nuclear and Alternative Energy Systems) has been the object of derision for its ballooned costs, years of delay, and undocumented pessimism about the potential of solar power.

In the business of advising government on research-related matters, the Academy is up against the fact that there are now many organizations—in and out of government—for performing big and presumably objective studies. These range all the way from the \$11-million-a-year Congressional Office of Technology Assessment down to the so-called Beltway Bandits—consulting firms in offices along the highway that rings Washington.

A big question awaits the next President of the National Academy of Sciences: is there a unique role for NAS? And that's only one of many questions that will confront the new chief.

... Says Concentration Hurts Export Market

(Continued from Page 5)

in a position to compete on foreign markets.

The working group compared Britain's position with that of West Germany, where public-sector purchasers undertake very little R&D. "By comparison with the United Kingdom, there is a different balance between the technical strengths of the purchasers and their suppliers. The principal centers of technical expertise lie in the supplying firms."

One problem is that "compared with other countries, the United Kingdom is remarkable for the size and centralization of many of its utilities and public services," the report notes. Britain's corporations are often much bigger than their counterparts in West Germany, or even the US. For example, the Central Electricity Generating Board (CEGB) operates the largest electricity-supply system in the world; and the National Coal Board accounts for more deep-mined coal than any other single organization. One consequence is that the UK doesn't have the small electricity utilities of the sort that ran the Three Mile Island power station. But

("R&D for Public Purchasing," ISBN 0 11 630 815 X, is available for £2.50—approximately \$5.35— from Government bookshops in Britain, including: 49 High Holborn St., London WC1V6HB, England.)

the CEGB is so important to its suppliers that they have to follow its wishes or go out of business. And in the past, the CEGB has been accused of ignoring exports when specifying equipment that, while suitable for domestic needs, cannot possibly be sold overseas.

According to the working group: "We do not therefore believe that the best interests of the UK are served by having the principal—and in some cases virtually the sole—R&D facility for an industry under the control of an organization whose function is that of user rather than of supplier and exporter." The answer is that "in general more R&D should be carried out in the private-sector interests responsible for marketing products or expertise, here and overseas."

Stressing, however, that the public corporations shouldn't give up R&D, the working group suggests a series of guidelines for deciding where R&D should be carried out. The public sector should, says the report, conduct R&D "necessary to explore new concepts and systems of operation, or the safe and efficient operation of existing systems," although even here there may be advantages in contracting some of this work out to suitable organizations.

Other criteria: the suppliers of equipment and services should carry out R&D that could lead to products or expertise that can be marketed outside the UK public

sector, "although financial support from the purchaser may in some cases be desirable." And the private sector should take part in the planning, direction, and funding of R&D that could lead within five years to equipment or expertise which can be marketed outside the UK public sector. If there is a possibility that export sales and sales to other UK buyers will be greater than sales to the public sector, then the supplier should control the R&D, as well as paying a substantial part of its cost.

The working group acknowledges that it isn't possible to switch R&D from the public sector to private industry overnight. To begin with Britain has some outstanding research centers operated by the nationalized industries, and to break them up would do more harm than good. Such action could, among other things, lead to a decline in the amount of R&D carried out, because "suppliers to public bodies have become accustomed to meeting tightly defined needs based on in-house R&D and not to undertake sufficient R&D themselves."

The report lists a number of recommendations that would help to achieve the switch of R&D from the public to the private sector. To begin with, the report says, "the Government should review the balance between the R&D carried out by purchasers and by suppliers in each industry where public purchasing decisions have significant influence and, in conjunction with the relevant purchasing organizations, should consider: whether . . . more R&D should be undertaken by suppliers; whether the remit given to the public sector R&D establishments in the industry is sufficiently wide; and whether a controlling Board for R&D . . . should

(Continued on Page 7)

House Subcommittee Seeks Halt In US-USSR Science Cooperation

A resolution calling for a six-month suspension of the 11 bilateral agreements governing US-USSR scientific and technological collaboration has been approved by the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology of the House Science and Technology Committee. The resolution (HJ Res. 513) was introduced by Subcommittee Chairman George E. Brown (D-Calif.) and Harold C. Hollenback (R-NJ), the ranking Republican. The full committee is scheduled to consider the resolution on April 17.

Though it's a flexible measure, giving the President final authority on a cutoff, the resolution does not appear likely to gain much support in Congress, which seems to be having second thoughts about the utility of ostracizing the Soviets, whether in science, sports, or trade.

Efforts to interest the Senate in the resolution haven't met any success.

Consulting: GAO Reports Lots of Ripoffs

From news accounts of the budget wars in Washington it is possible to obtain the impression that the economizers have cut down to bare bone, and that, if anything, essentially public services are experiencing massive damage.

It may well be that some are—particularly those intended to assist the very poor. But then one encounters a great deal of contrary evidence concerning the financial behavior of government, and it becomes difficult to avoid the impression that there's a lot of loose money rattling around the agencies responsible for carrying on the public's business.

Such an impression leaps from a recent report by the General Accounting Office (GAO), titled "Controls over Consulting Service Contracts at Federal Agencies Need Tightening." Prepared for the Human Resources Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the GAO report dishes out one tale after another about large amounts of government money paid to consulting organizations for nonsensical purposes, and sometimes for no apparent purpose at all.

Following are some of the choicer items from the GAO report, copies of which may be obtained without charge by requesting Publication PSAD-80-35, March 20, 1980, from: GAO, Room 1518, 441 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20548:

A Department of Energy contract for \$343,834 for comprehensive analysis of issues regarding resource development on Indian reservations. In the contract justification statement, the agency stated that reports generated by this study would help the agency in policy

development. Program officials could not specifically explain or document any use made of the contract results by the agency.

A Department of Transportation contract for \$150,000 for an analysis of the economic impact of proposed regulations. The study is being made to provide information for the research analysis required by an executive order. The analysis was intended to be available to the public during the period the proposed regulations were open to public comment. However, the contractor did not start work on the study until after they were published, and the study was not completed until after the close of the public comment period.

A Department of Commerce contract awarded for \$36,000 resulting from an unsolicited proposal to prepare a series of technology transfer bulletins, assess this method of technology transfer, and recommend alternatives. Program officials said, but could provide no documentation, that technology information was requested by the industry at meetings with the Division Director. Additionally, the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative said that the information contained in the bulletins was obtainable prior to the issuance of the bulletins, though the process could be cumbersome. Before the assessment was completed, the con-

(Continued on Page 8)

BRITAIN *(Continued from Page 6)*

be established."

Other recommendations include the suggestion that "the Government should consider how the expertise of public sector R&D establishments may be effectively marketed abroad, without adversely affecting their support for United Kingdom industry or its competitive position." The working group also calls upon the public sector organizations to meet some of their R&D requirements by competitive tendering. The public sector organizations "with significant purchasing programs" should also establish central units where they have not already done so "to increase the benefits to industry of their R&D and purchasing programs, particularly in regard to exports."

It was also recommended that the government review its support for the R&D programs of public corporations and determine an overall strategy for support of innovation in them.—MK

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$89.50 ☐; two years, \$168.50 ☐

Individual subscribers: one year, \$48.50 ☐; two years, \$82.50 ☐

(Overseas airmail, \$17.50 per year additional.)

Name

Address

Zip

... Study Cites Big Spending, Small Returns

(Continued from Page 7)

tract was modified to continue with the bulletins. The modification doubled the cost and period of performance.

•

A Department of Energy contract for \$27,000 awarded on a sole-source basis because of time exigency for testimony relating to a regulatory proceeding. The testimony, however, was never filed because the agency head thought that the contractor was defining Government policy, and that should have been the agency's responsibility.

•

A Department of Commerce contractor who had a previous affiliation with the agency proposed to demonstrate the technique he had helped develop under a previous contract. The agency's interest was renewed and a contract totaling \$59,150 to perform a demonstration project for private industry was awarded. The participants disagreed strongly about the need for the system demonstrated and the project came to an end.

•

An Office of Education contract for \$71,000 to study regional educational service agencies. A sole-source award was justified on the basis that the contractor "is the only firm that can reasonably and economically meet the contract requirements." A program official said that the sole-source justification was written by the contractor. On top of this, over \$55,000 (78 per cent) of the contract cost was subcontracted with the subcontractor's statement of work essentially the same as the prime contractor's.

Payroll Politics and Consulting

What's rarely mentioned in diatribes against the consulting industry is that a great deal of government contracting for consultants flourishes as a result of political pressures to hold down the federal payroll.

All presidents in recent years have sought to outdo their predecessors in limiting direct federal employment, and they all boast that they have a smaller White House payroll than the last occupant. The claims are simultaneously true and false. While the number of people being paid for direct services for the US government keeps going up, the number of civilian federal employees has remained fairly stable for many years—at around 2.9 million.

Government, of course, is bigger than ever and requires more hands to run it. How is this accomplished with fewer employees? Easily. By contracting out work that might be done by federal workers.

The same kind of makework and no-work that the GAO found among contractors can easily be found in the government's own offices, and often is. It's just that we've come to expect goofing off in government service, but are startled when it occurs in the supposedly efficient private sector.

•

A Department of Commerce unsolicited proposal for \$32,155 from a university to conduct seminars and write research papers on various international trade topics. Contracts have been awarded for the same subject since 1976. The Contracting Officer's Technical Representative could provide no evidence as to the usefulness of the seminars or the value of the research papers. The papers are merely distributed to persons requesting copies.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

9999

Xerox University Microfilms
300 N Zeeb Rd
Ann Arbor

MI 48106

